

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. This paper does not amend, add, or cancel any of the claims. Claims 1, 17, and 22 are the independent claims of the application. Claims 1-14, 17-25, and 27 stand rejected. Claims 15, 16, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the notification of allowable subject matter in claims 15, 16, and 26.

Specification Amendment

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the specification, in numbered paragraph [0003], provides incorrect data for the Drori patent. The specification has been amended to recite the correct number for the Drori patent, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant believes that the amendment of the specification obviates the objection.

Art Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14, 17-25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider *et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 4,856,072 (hereinafter “Schneider”) in view of Drori *et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 4,888,064. We understand the reference to U.S. Patent Number 4,888,064 to be intended as a reference to U.S. Patent Number 4,887,064 (hereinafter “Drori”).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims for the reasons discussed below.

Independent Claim 1

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Office Action acknowledged that Schneider “does not specifically mention the light indicator to flashing sequences as claimed by the applicant.” Applicant understands this statement to mean that Schneider is deficient with respect to teaching the indicator light interface circuit limitation of claim 1. The Office Action then sought to combine Drori with Schneider to overcome this admitted deficiency in Schneider’s disclosure. In particular, the Office Action asserted (at page 3) that

Drori teaches a vehicle security system to detect unauthorized person entry to or tampering the vehicle components as door, trunk or windows which having a controller couple to indicator light as LED (99) and to generate a sequence of light flashes to communicate information to driver as regarding the security events as programmed as defective device [figs. 5, 18, col. 3, lines 41-61 and col. 8, lines 50-64].

Applicant notes that claim 1 recites, among other limitations, “an indicator light interface circuit coupled to an indicator light of a security system to sense ON and OFF states of the indicator light and provide a first signal responsive to the states of the indicator light.” (Underlining was added for emphasis in the immediately preceding quotation.) The Office Action apparently did not assert that Drori teaches such an interface circuit. Drori does not teach or suggest such interface circuit.

The first Drori text fragment cited by the Office Action in support of the rejection of claim 1 reads as follows:

The system further comprises means for communicating to the system user a message indicating that a sensor is defective, and further specifying the particular defective sensor. This may take the form of an audio transducer for producing a

particular audio tone or tones indicative of the defective sensor condition, such as siren chirps, and an LED for generating an optical light flash sequence for identifying the defective sensor, e.g., three light flashes indicates a failed door trigger switch, or a spoken language message generated by a voice synthesizer which specifies the defective device.

The system further comprises means for warning the system user, upon receipt of a system disarm signal, of an attempted intrusion during the armed mode, and for identifying the intrusion point. The warning means may comprise a voice message generated by a voice synthesizer or an audio transducer for providing a predetermined audio sound sequence indicative of an intrusion attempt, e.g., three chirps. The identifying means may take the form of an LED for signaling by a flash code the intrusion point.

Drori, col. 3, lines 41-61. The second Drori text fragment cited by the Office Action reads thus:

FIGS. 5A and 5B illustrate respective driver circuits for the green and red LED devices 99 which are employed in the disclosed embodiment to provide a means for visually communicating with the user of the system. Pin P18 of the microcomputer 70 controls the green LED driver circuit of FIG. 5A and pin P19 controls the red LED driver of FIG. 5B. The green LED driver circuit comprises an inverter device 272, NPN transistor 274, PNP transistors 276 and 278 connected in the manner shown in FIG. 5A. The operation of the driver circuit of FIG. 5A as well as that of FIG. 5B will be readily understood by those skilled in the art. In the case of the security system installed in a vehicle, the LEDs 99 may be mounted on the vehicle instrument panel or dashboard.

Drori, col. 8, lines 50-64.

While Drori discloses “an LED for generating an optical light flash sequence for identifying the defective sensor,” “an LED for signaling by a flash code the intrusion point,” and “respective driver circuits for the green and red LED devices 99,” it does not disclose an LED interface circuit that senses ON and OFF states of the indicator light. Assuming that Drori’s LED is an “indicator light,” Drori apparently does not contain a disclosure of an interface circuit that would sense ON and OFF states of the indicator light and provide a first signal responsive to the states of the indicator light.

Claim 1 also recites “a processing component coupled to the interface circuit and to the sound generating component to receive the first signal and cause the sound generating component to

generate speech announcements in response to flashing sequences of ON and OFF states of the indicator light.” The Office Action asserted (at pages 2-3) that Schneider discloses “a speech synthesis (16) coupled the sensors (20, 24, 26, 28, 30) and the microcomputer (14) generating the voiced signal in response to the flashing of LED indicator (48) (fig. 1, col. 2, line 39 to col. 3, line 45].” We have reviewed Schneider’s cited text, but have not been able to identify a disclosure of generating speech announcements in response to flashing sequences of ON and OFF states of the indicator light.

Furthermore, the Office Action apparently acknowledged that Schneider does not disclose the indicator light interface circuit. It appears logically impossible for the Schneider reference to teach a processing component that acts in response to a signal generated by an element that the reference admittedly does not disclose.

The references of record therefore fail to disclose or suggest all the elements/limitations recited in claim 1, and therefore fail to render this claim obvious. At least for this reason, independent claim 1 is patentable over Schneider and Drori.

Independent Claims 17 and 22

Independent claims 17 and 22 recite limitations similar to the interface circuit discussed above in relation to claim 1, and should be patentable over the references at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent Claims

With regard to claim 3, the Office Action stated that Schneider discloses “a comparator device which are programmed in the memory device (44) by the user.” Claim 3, however, recites

that “the indicator light interface circuit comprises a comparator capable of performing comparisons between a second signal from the security system and a predetermined level, and generating the first signal based on the comparisons.” Note that the first signal generated by the comparator is “responsive to the states of the indicator light,” as recited in base claim 1. Schneider does not teach or suggest a comparator that generates a signal responsive to the states of the indicator light.

It appears that the Office Action analogizes the function of the comparator of claim 3 to comparing voice templates as disclosed in Schneider. The comparator of claim 3 operates on a signal, not on a voice template. Furthermore, the comparator of claim 3 compares the signal to a predetermined level. In contrast, Schneider discloses comparisons between voice templates. Schneider does not teach or suggest a comparator configured as recited in claim 3. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 3 is separately patentable over the references.

Dependent claim 4 recites that “the indicator light interface circuit comprises an optoelectronic component optically coupled to the indicator light to sense the states of the indicator light and generate the first signal in response to the states of the indicator light.” There appears to be no mention in Schneider or in Drori of an optoelectronic component optically coupled to the indicator light to sense the state of the indicator light, as recited in claim 4. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 4 is separately patentable over the references.

With regard to dependent claim 5, it appears that neither Schneider nor Drori discloses or suggests suppressing a first speech announcement that follows a second speech announcement within a first predetermined time period if the first speech announcement is identical to the second speech announcement, as recited in this claim. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 5 is separately patentable over the references.

With regard to dependent claims 10, 19, 24, and 25, it appears that neither Schneider nor Drori discloses or suggests storing speech synthesis segments in compressed form, or uncompressing data before sending the data to a DAC or otherwise using the data after uncompression to generate speech. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 10, 19, 24, and 25 are separately patentable over the references.

Dependent claim 13 recites “means for learning sets of attributes of the flashing sequences and the announcements corresponding to the sets of attributes.” The Office Action has failed to provide a citation to Schneider and Drori that can be identified as teaching or suggesting all these additional limitations of claim 13. We have reviewed both references, but have not been able to identify a disclosure or suggestion of the additional limitations of claim 13, such as learning sets of attributes of the flashing sequences. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 13 is separately patentable over the references.

Dependent claim 20 recites “a microphone coupled to the processor so that the processor is capable of sensing microphone signals generated by the microphone in response to sound, wherein the processor is capable of obtaining speech synthesis segment data corresponding to the announcements by prompting a user of the security system to cause the security system to generate flashing of the indicator light, prompting the user to speak the announcements into the microphone, and recording the microphone signals generated in response to the user speaking the announcements.” The Office Action stated that “Schneider discloses the microcomputer (14)/digital to analog (D/A) having microphones (36, 38) and input device/keypad (22) to store input information into the memory device (44) by the user to activate the sound components (19, 40, 42) [fig. 1, col. 2, line 28 to col. 3, line 45].” Claim 20, however, includes recitations of the specific way in which the components are configured, such as *obtaining speech synthesis segment data*

corresponding to the announcements by prompting a user of the security system to cause the security system to generate flashing of the indicator light, prompting the user to speak the announcements into the microphone, and recording the microphone signals generated in response to the user speaking the announcements. It appears that Schneider and Drori do not disclose all of these limitations. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 20 is separately patentable over the references.

Other Dependent Claims

The discussion above addresses rejections of all independent claims and of several dependant claims. As regards dependent claims not specifically addressed, these claims should be patentable at least for the same reasons as their base claims and intervening claims, if any.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable over the references. To discuss any matter pertaining to the instant application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (858) 720-9431.

Having made an effort to bring the application in condition for allowance, a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 15, 2006



Anatoly S. Weiser, Reg. No. 43,229
12526 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
(858) 720-9431